

18.08.2025
Court No. 36
Sl. No. 05
Cp/Gb

WPCRC 113 of 2025
In
WPA No. 704 of 2023

Nripati Halder
-Vs.-
Dulali Halder

Mr. Sudip Sarkar
Mr. Sukdeb Sarkar

... for the applicant.

Mr. Saikat Chatterjee

.....for the alleged contemnor.

Smt. Dulali Halder, Pradhan of Dhanurhat Gram Panchayat is present in court in response to the Rule.

A compliance report has been handed over which shows that a reasoned order has been passed and the construction of both the parties have been found to be unauthorized. The parties have been asked to remove the unauthorized construction within 10 days from August 12, 2025, failing which the gram panchayat has reserved the right to proceed in accordance with law.

Mr. Saikat Chatterjee, learned advocate for the alleged contemnor, submits that in terms of Section 23(5) of the Panchayat Act steps shall be taken to transmit the records to the concerned Sub-Divisional Officer. It is submitted specifically that the

construction of both the parties have been found to be unauthorized.

Learned advocate for the applicant/writ petitioner submits that the writ petitioner's construction is not a pucca construction, and as such, the law would not be applicable. However, this is not an issue which has to be decided in this proceeding because this is a contempt proceeding.

The court does not find any intentional violation of its order, save and except, the delay. The delay is condoned as the steps have been taken by the gram panchayat.

The applicant shall be at liberty to challenge the order before the appropriate forum in accordance with law, if the applicant is aggrieved by the findings of the gram panchayat.

Accordingly the contempt application is disposed of and the contempt proceeding is dropped. The Rule is discharged.

Personal appearance of the alleged contemnor is dispensed with.

(Shampa Sarkar, J.)